

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith is two attached sheets of drawing including new Fig. 1 and new Fig. 2. These sheets are labeled [NEW SHEET].

Attachment(s): New Sheet (Fig. 1)
 New Sheet (Fig. 2)

REMARKS

Claims 6 to 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The amendments to the claims are shown by underlining (for additions) and strikeouts (for deletions).

The Drawings have been amended. Specifically, new Figures 1 and 2 have been added. No new matter has been added to the Drawings.

The Specification has been amended. No new matter has been added to the Specification of record.

Claims 6 to 15 are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

Notice of Not Fully Responsive Reply for Applications Under Accelerated Examination

Applicants thank the Examiner for Notice of certain informalities in Applicants' response dated September 21, 2006.

Applicants inquire whether the present application is under accelerated examination. Applicants do not recall making any request for such, and did not receive any notice of such.

Applicants apologize for the error in numbering the claims. The claims have been renumbered above as advised from claim 6 to claim 15. Acceptance of this renumbering is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the drawing (Figure 1) submitted on September 21, 2006 was fully responsive under the rules. Applicants respectfully submit a new drawing (Figure 2) for consideration by the Patent Office in response to the Examiner's request. Acceptance of Figures 1 and 2 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants appropriately have referenced International Patent Publication PCT/EP00/08263. Since the present application is a U.S. national phase application (and not a continuation/divisional/CIP), the claim to priority of the underlying priority document to the International Patent Publication, as well as identification that the present application is the U.S. national phase application of PCT/EP00/08263, has been made in Applicants' Application Transmittal dated May 1, 2001, and in Applicants' Declaration and Power of Attorney submitted to the U.S. Patent Office on June 28, 2001. Additionally, the International Bureau should have also forwarded any relevant documents to the U.S. Patent Office concerning same. Under the rules, this is believed to be appropriate notice. Acceptance of Applicants' notices and acknowledgement of Applicants' priority documents sent by the International Bureau is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' use of "arrangement" in the preamble of claims 11 to 15 is proper. In the interests of prosecution of the present application,

Applicants have amended claims 11 to 15 to recite a “system.” Acceptance of Applicants’ amendment to the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the response made with respect to the claim rejections was distinct and specific. However, Applicants have added additional specificity to the remarks below in an effort to show that the cited reference(s) do not render the present application unpatentable. Acceptance of Applicants’ remarks is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The Drawings were objected to for not showing some limitations from the claims. The Drawings have been amended to correct all of these informalities. New Figures 1 and 2 have been added. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the Drawings in view of the above amendments.

The Specification

The Specification was modified in accordance with the changes to the Drawings. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, claims 8 and 13 recite “the digital broadcasting network.” Antecedent bases have been corrected above. Claim 10 to 14 recite “an arrangement.” Those claims are system claims and have been amended to more clearly recite this. No new matter has been added to the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no indefiniteness remains in the claims and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 to 7, 9 to 12, and 14, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,170,005 to Meandzija (“Meandzija reference”) in view of WO 96/07267 to Chaney (“Chaney reference”).

The Meandzija reference refers to synchronization and information exchange between communication components using a network management operations and control paradigm. The Meandzija reference concerns a management entity component, such as a computer workstation operated at a control center, coordinates the actions of different agent components, such as hardware used at the headend or uplink site of a television network.

The Chaney reference concerns a system processing a video signal including a

plurality of signal components representing respective ones of a plurality of video programs such as pay-TV programs.

In contrast to both the Meandzija and Chaney references, claim 5 is directed to a method for clearing a customer-specific entitlement in a conditional access system to receive a chargeable service from a service provider by using a security module including: specifically assigning an EMM clearing signal to the security module to provide a specifically assigned EMM clearing signal; and controlling a right-of-access by a customer through a service center, in response to a request from the service provider to the service center, using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal by performing one of: (i) an indirect clearing operation of: sending the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal from the service center to the service provider via at least one of a telephone system and a data communication system; feeding the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal for the chargeable service into a control unit of the service provider; and activating the security module via the control unit by using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal; and (ii) a direct clearing operation by sending the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal from the service center, with an assistance of a data transmission service in a digital broadcasting service, to the security module to clear the customer. Neither reference – alone or in combination – describe each and every feature of claim 5 as required. For example, the Meandzija reference concerns agent components, such as hardware used at the headend or uplink site of a television network, to provide conditional access to a television signal by inserting conditional access data into the transmitted programming, where management information bases are provided for the agent components and the agent components update their management information bases with changes, for example, in television schedule. And the management component reads the management information bases to obtain the updated information and store its own management information base. The Meandzija reference does not teach or suggest the security focus of the present invention, specifically, for example, the multi-step tasks provided in claim 10. Further, the Chaney reference does not teach or suggest the security focus either. Instead, the Chaney reference appears to concern itself with a system processing a video signal. Accordingly, the Meandzija and Chaney reference do not render the claims unenforceable. The remaining claims 6, 7, 9 to 12, and 14, are dependent on or recite features analogous to claim 5. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Further, such combination of references is not believed proper since each goes to separate technologies.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 5 to 14, renumbered above as claims 6 to 15, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the objections and rejections to the present application have been obviated, and that pending claims 6 to 15 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: January 3, 2007

By: Linda Shudy Lecomte

Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646